Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JERR_103009**
Title of the Manuscript:	**To judge the power circuit breaker interrupting time and the prediction of maintenance schedule with Normal distribution probability.**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** 4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** 5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** 6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. The author explores the possibilities of applying such a standard of statistical measurements as a normal Gaussian probability distribution to cases of not quite normal distribution. This is done in an excellent way and demonstrated with two examples. I think it will be very useful for the readers of the Journal.** **2. The title of the article corresponds to the marketing task to attract attention. It corresponds to one of the problems solved by the technical idea proposed by the author. I think the name should be left as it is.** **3. The abstract is written briefly and clearly: it is clear what the content of the article is about.** **4. The structure of the article is excellent, thoughtful.** **5. The scientific character is expressed, although in a lapidary form, but quite correctly. In this aspect, I have no comments.** **6. The list of links is quite relevant and not redundant.**	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Good	
Optional/General comments	Read the text carefully to eliminate minor typos such as *the latter Z* instead of *the letter Z* at the end of the sixth section	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Petr Mikhailovich Korolev**
Department, University & Country	**Russia**